

Date: Sat, 22 May 93 01:37:30 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #159  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 22 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 159

Today's Topics:

    Is there some kind of problem here? (4 msgs)  
    licensing question -- international usage OK?  
        More on no-code  
        No-Code Stupidity  
        Put up or Shut up! (6 msgs)  
    Restructuring the Amateur Radio Service

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 21 May 1993 07:36:41 GMT  
From: cronkite.cisco.com!dstine@ames.arpa  
Subject: Is there some kind of problem here?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1tgv3sINNc2b@west.West.Sun.COM> flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd  
[Phoenix SE]) writes:

>  
>When is this whine-o-rama going to stop?

When the people who want everything for nothing either get what they want  
or a clue.

>You codeless tech debaters just kill me. Many of you would  
>love so dearly to be excused from CW so that you could...  
>....What??? Get on HF!!?

Ta-da!

>Let me give you a clue: Most of HF sucks anyway. It's not  
>much more than CB with callsigns these days.

A small, but important clarification: the part of HF on which one usually operates SSB sucks. The CW portions of the bands are still relatively free of lids, kids and space cadets. I, myself, think that the 30 meter and 160 meter bands are simply \_wonderful\_ places to chat. Using CW of course.

Oh, what's that? You didn't want to operate CW? You just wanted to use 'phone? Oh... I'm sorry. Then indeed, HF sucks. Just listen to 20 'phone on a contest weekend.

>Excuse me, did you say you wanted HF Digital Mode  
>Privlidges so you can blaze around the world at 300 baud  
>with an effective throughput of a conga drum???

Well, that's using amateur technology -- commercial-grade HF modems can get you up to 9600 bps.

>Yes, I learned the code and look where it got me.

Well, it got you good and cranky, that's for sure. ;-)

dsa

-----

Date: 20 May 93 22:01:32 GMT  
From: sun-barr!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!west.West.Sun.COM!l1-a!flloyd@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Is there some kind of problem here?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

When is this whine-o-rama going to stop? This latest CW eruption has lasted longer than the California drought. Who started it anyway? Get a rope :-)

You codeless tech debaters just kill me. Many of you would love so dearly to be excused from CW so that you could...  
....What??? Get on HF!!?

Let me give you a clue: Most of HF sucks anyway. It's not much more than CB with callsigns these days.

Excuse me, did you say you wanted HF Digital Mode  
Privlidges so you can blaze around the world at 300 baud  
with an effective throughput of a conga drum??? For

pennies of what what you could spend for a decent HF packet collision these days you could just make a long distance phone call and connect at 9600 or greater baud - and be collision free. HF is Digital dreamland? Hardly. It's a goat-rope which operates no differently than a Pitcairn Pileup on SSB.

Just admit it - it's not what you could do with access to HF, you're only whining because you can't have it 'for free'.

Yes, I learned the code and look where it got me. Access to the whole kilowatt playground. Four years later, my HF rig makes a good bookend. And guess what? If code requirements were lowered or dropped, do you think things would improve?

My advice: learn the code and get the upgrade now, because the bands will never be any better.

Believe me, you will tire of it quickly...

-fred

[ Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ	Fred.Lloyd@West.Sun.COM ]
[ Sun Microsystems,	Systems Engineer ]
[ Phoenix, AZ	(602) 224-3517 ]

-----  
Date: Thu, 20 May 93 23:05:09 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!r\_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Is there some kind of problem here?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1tgv3sINNc2b@west.West.Sun.COM> flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:

>  
>When is this whine-o-rama going to stop? This latest CW  
>eruption has lasted longer than the California drought.  
>Who started it anyway? Get a rope :-)  
>  
>You codeless tech debaters just kill me. Many of you would  
>love so dearly to be excused from CW so that you could...  
>....What??? Get on HF!!?  
>  
>Let me give you a clue: Most of HF sucks anyway. It's not

>much more than CB with callsigns these days.

Don't get me started on that again...:)

>Excuse me, did you say you wanted HF Digital Mode  
>Privlidges so you can blaze around the world at 300 baud  
>with an effective throughput of a conga drum??? For  
>pennies of what what you could spend for a decent HF packet  
>collision these days you could just make a long distance  
>phone call and connect at 9600 or greater baud - and be  
>collision free. HF is Digital dreamland? Hardly. It's a  
>goat-rope which operates no differently than a Pitcairn  
>Pileup on SSB.

>Just admit it - it's not what you could do with access to  
>HF, you're only whining because you can't have it 'for  
>free'.

>

>Yes, I learned the code and look where it got me. Access  
>to the whole kilowatt playground. Four years later, my HF  
>rig makes a good bookend. And guess what? If code  
>requirements were lowered or dropped, do you think things  
>would improve?

>

>My advice: learn the code and get the upgrade now, because  
>the bands will never be any better.

>

>Believe me, you will tire of it quickly...

Well, it's great to have some one that can speak for the ENTIRE  
amateur radio community. You ask the "whiners" to stop, but it looks  
like you're the one whineing. Why don't you do us all a favor and go  
back to rec.sex.farm.animals, you'll probably be more at home there  
anyway. I hate the fuckin experts...

Ron  
N1HIB

If your gonna flame me, do it soon, because I'm outta here in 2 days!!!!

-----

Date: Fri, 21 May 1993 00:22:52 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Is there some kind of problem here?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:

:  
: When is this whine-o-rama going to stop? This latest CW  
: eruption has lasted longer than the California drought.  
: Who started it anyway? Get a rope :-)  
:  
: You codeless tech debaters just kill me. Many of you would  
: love so dearly to be excused from CW so that you could...  
: ....What??? Get on HF!!?  
:  
: Let me give you a clue: Most of HF sucks anyway. It's not  
: much more than CB with callsigns these days.  
:  
: Excuse me, did you say you wanted HF Digital Mode  
: Privlidges so you can blaze around the world at 300 baud  
: with an effective throughput of a conga drum??? For  
: pennies of what what you could spend for a decent HF packet  
: collision these days you could just make a long distance  
: phone call and connect at 9600 or greater baud - and be  
: collision free. HF is Digital dreamland? Hardly. It's a  
: goat-rope which operates no differently than a Pitcairn  
: Pileup on SSB.  
:  
: Just admit it - it's not what you could do with access to  
: HF, you're only whining because you can't have it 'for  
: free'.  
:  
: Yes, I learned the code and look where it got me. Access  
: to the whole kilowatt playground. Four years later, my HF  
: rig makes a good bookend. And guess what? If code  
: requirements were lowered or dropped, do you think things  
: would improve?  
:  
: My advice: learn the code and get the upgrade now, because  
: the bands will never be any better.  
:  
: Believe me, you will tire of it quickly...

Gee Fred, I really feel sorry for you. If you are so disappointed with the whole thing why are you still active? I know you are because I can't believe you made any money off those CD's at that price. :-)

If there is anyone else out there who feels the same way as Fred please don't bother investing in HF equipment and just get the VHF no-code license it will allow you to do everything you want.

Why would you advise to upgrade now? Seems like you would be better served by a no-code license anyway.

I hope this was supposed to be funny and it just went over my head. If not try another hobby you enjoy more.

Keep your chin up,

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!             *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: 21 May 93 20:08:22 GMT

From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!gsherwin@uunet.uu.net

Subject: licensing question -- international usage OK?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

No - this is not a simple "can I talk to XXX country" question, but one regarding a friend who is Australian here in the States. He is interested in getting his ham license here, but wants to know this:

If you get a ham license here in the States from the FCC, does that allow you to broadcast while within another country? Now I am sure there are probably variations from country to country, but I am curious to know if there is a general policy that exists in most countries that allow you broadcast within that country if you are licensed in another country, adhere to some local rules, etc. without requiring you to get an Australian ham license, for example.

E-mail responses are preferred, but this might be one worth posting too I suppose.

Thanks in advance and 73.

greg - KD6QPY

--

```
greg          | "You want a mystery? Pick up your phone book ...
gsherwin@nyx.cs.du.edu | and tell me what are all these people doing living
yeah, "PEACE" this    | around here?"          -- Howe Gelb
```

-----

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 23:34:46 CDT

From: news.acns.nwu.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!  
amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: More on no-code  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

> -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."

In that case, Paul, this MUST be the MOST PATRIOTIC newsgroup on Usenet.

--Robert

-----  
Date: 21 May 93 20:36:29 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!gsherwin@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: No-Code Stupidity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May16.214331.20770@anomaly.sbs.com> wr1r@anomaly.sbs.com (Frank Almeida (WR1R)) writes:

>I'm pretty new to this whole bunch of discussion about code versus no-code.  
>You people should get a life, learning code has been around for a long  
>time and if I had to learn it to 20 words per minute then you're going  
>to have to learn it to 20 words too.  
>

I support the preservation of code as much as the next guy, but a post like this amusingly sounds akin to something like this:

Well, when I was your age we walked 20 miles to go to school in a blizzard! And we drank cod liver oil and loved it! You kids are going to have to do the same thing, you lazy oafs!

No flames intended -- put away that asbestos underwear. Just an observation that amused me.

--  
greg | "You want a mystery? Pick up your phone book ...  
gsherwin@nyx.cs.du.edu | and tell me what are all these people doing living  
yeah, "PEACE" this | around here?" -- Howe Gelb

-----  
Date: 20 May 1993 19:35:46 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!news.bbn.com!levin@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Put up or Shut up!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

|Q: Image communication is permitted on what portion of the 15 meter band:

- |A) 21,225 kHz - 21,300 kHz
- |B) 21,000 kHz - 21,100 kHz
- |C) 21,200 kHz - 21,450 kHz
- |D) 21,100 kHz - 21,450 kHz

|where the person being examined can remember that the answer to the  
|question about image and 15 meters is C. My suggestion is that a program  
|with a table of the 15 meter band plan could generate an equivalent  
|question that can't be memorized. The knowledge to answer the question  
|would need to be known, not just C.

I had the impression from the tests I took in March, generated by the  
ARRL/VEC test software, that the choices were in fact randomly  
rearranged and did not correspond to the orders in the published  
question pools. So memorizing (C) is not good enough.

The question pool system may be written into part 97, mandating a lot  
of procedure to change how tests are done. Another thing that might  
be done is simply to double or triple the size of the pools.

(Yes, so after I studied the ARRL guides I went through the question  
pools twice before I took the tests. So sue me!)

/JBL KD10N

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com |  
pots: (617)873-3463 |  
KD10N |

"I gotta go."  
-- I. Shoales

-----

Date: 21 May 93 13:51:25 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Put up or Shut up!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>where the person being examined can remember that the answer to the  
>question about image and 15 meters is C. My suggestion is that a program

the ARRL programs have the option to shuffle the answers around - and you can  
say you always want the answer to Q25 to be "D" or you can let that change as  
well (unique keys for every test....) or you can leave everything just as it  
is in the pool.



(a new version of this program is due soon....i would think they wouldn't change that code, but you knever gno.)

it would be possible to do a bad job on the replaceable parameters questions such that every test generated would have to be checked to see that the test generator didn't come up with a set of values that were incorrect or accidentally made 2 right answers...

bill wb9ivr

-----

Date: 21 May 93 21:08:31 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Put up or Shut up!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Todd was commenting about people remebering that a given answer to a question was C. In fact this wouldn't work under the current testing system. The examiners DO NOT have to have the answers in the same order as the answers in the pools (however, the text of the questions and answers does have to be identical to those in the pools). The answer may equally well be A, B, C or D for any question. This point is left up to the VEC.

The folks I have seen "memorise" the questions and answers do it by highlighting just the correct answer and remebering cues from that answer. Of course they avoid learning any useful information that way :-(

I would go along with the expansion of the pool size as a solution (the pools must be public otherwise you could give arbitraly difficult exams to folks who you don't like becuase the either have or don't have the code).

What about questions with numerical answers -- fill in the blank would work here as the answer is unambigious.

The worst thing about the pools is that they contain questions in which all four answers are incorrect (the one about resonant antennas and why htye are 'better' springs to mind!).

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP  
a-kevinp@microsoft.com  
"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

-----

Date: Fri, 21 May 1993 00:07:44 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Put up or Shut up!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

levin@bbn.com (Joel B Levin) writes:

>I had the impression from the tests I took in March, generated by the  
>ARRL/VEC test software, that the choices were in fact randomly  
>rearranged and did not correspond to the orders in the published  
>question pools. So memorizing (C) is not good enough.

That may be the case. Still I was looking for something that takes the  
1000's of different possibly combinations of bands, modes, and privileges  
for example and generates the questions from those possibilities. Not  
simply rearranging a fixed set of answers to a fixed set of questions.

Perhaps a better example would have been to ask something along the lines  
of: "What is the length in feet of a dipole antenna for 22.5 MHz?" Or  
"What is the wavelength in meters of a 9.3 MHz signal?" The actual  
frequency would be selected at random by the testing software and common  
errors generated as detractors. This would make it possible to generate  
thousands of different variants of these questions all from a couple of  
simple rules. Even with multiple choice, this would be substantially more  
difficult than the current scheme. In addition, it would make knowledge of  
or publication of the question pool a moot point. The templates could be  
published since they only represent a class of questions, not specific  
questions.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: 21 May 93 14:17:18 GMT  
From: noc.near.net!news.bbn.com!levin@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Put up or Shut up!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

|To whom in the ARRL do members write in order to voice opinions about the  
|new pools for 3B-4B?

You write to the three members (and the alternate) of the Question  
Pool Committee, a subcommittee of the 18 VECs (of which the ARRL/VEC is  
only one. I have the names etc. and details at home, along with the  
deadlines for submitting proposed questions and comments for the  
various pools. If you are really interested, write me (I won't be

able to answer before Monday, though). ARRL/VEC can also provide this information (that's where I got it).

73 / JBL

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com | "GO TO JAIL. Go directly to jail. Do not pass  
POTS: (617)873-3463 | Go. Do not collect \$200."  
KD10N | -- Parker Brothers

-----  
Date: Fri, 21 May 1993 00:09:22 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Put up or Shut up!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

levin@bbn.com (Joel B Levin) writes:

:  
: I had the impression from the tests I took in March, generated by the  
: ARRL/VEC test software, that the choices were in fact randomly  
: rearranged and did not correspond to the orders in the published  
: question pools. So memorizing (C) is not good enough.

Perhaps yours were done that way. It is up to the VE's to choose how they handle the exam, they can rearrange the answers and I believe they are even allowed to use their own distractors. I think the correct answer has to be verbatim from the pool though.

: The question pool system may be written into part 97, mandating a lot  
: of procedure to change how tests are done. Another thing that might  
: be done is simply to double or triple the size of the pools.

Actually although 97.503 and 97.523 do specify the use of a question pool they do not require that the questions be of any particular type so there is no reason to change the regfs to get most of this done. To whom in the ARRL do members write in order to voice opinions about the new pools for 3B-4B?

: (Yes, so after I studied the ARRL guides I went through the question  
: pools twice before I took the tests. So sue me!) :  
I looked over the pools too, who wouldn't?

Dan

--

\*-----\*  
\* Daniel D. Todd           Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa           \*  
\*                           Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu                \*  
\*

\*                  Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102                  \*  
\*                                  Davis CA 95616                  \*  
\*-----\*  
\*          I do not speak for the University of California....  \*  
\*          and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!          \*  
\*-----\*

-----  
Date: Fri, 21 May 1993 17:53:45 GMT  
From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!noose.ecn.purdue.edu!moon.ecn.purdue.edu!  
gerde@purdue.edu  
Subject: Restructuring the Amateur Radio Service  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

My fellow Hams:

This is something that I have been thinking about for several years. From Fred Maia (W5YI) and Wayne Green to this group, there has been constant talk on the problems of how the US Amateur Radio Service is licensed. There are too many classes, little upward continually and too many levels of code tests.

What I would propose is a total of four (4) classes, four (4) exams (to include code) and a license structure that focuses an upward path. We now have three code elements: 1a - 5wpm, 1b - 13wpm and 1c - 21wpm. Why not just Element 1, a 50 character per minute (cpm) (10 wpm) test? Keep Element 2 but combine Elements 3a & 3b back together (Element 3). Do the same for Elements 4a & 4b. These (Elements 3 and 4) are now much harder tests.

Novice license test would be Elements 1 and 2. Technician would be Elements 2 & 3. To get the General license, the Novice would take Element 3 and the Technician takes code test (Element 1). The highest license, the Extra Class, takes Element 4. Everything is covered with upward mobility yet the test are hard enough to be a challenge.

Novice class privileges would be access to all HF code/digital bands with limits to only the transmission of textual information. Voice privileges would be on 17m, 10m and 6m. I would drop 220 and 1270 Mhz privileges as these do reflect the HF orientation of the Novice class (yes, 6m does). Power limit is 250 Watts.

Technician class would retain all the current privileges for above 30 Mhz. Power would be limited to 250 Watts. No real changes here.

General class would be a merging of HF and VHF/UHF. All Novice and

Technician privileges plus the use of voice and graphic data transmission in the HF bands. Power would however be limited to 250 Watts. Extra class retains its special frequency segments in the 80m, 20m and 15m bands. And of all the classes, Extra class operators are allowed 1500 watts of power. Plus the right to be VEs, OOs and such other duties.

This is simple. Is it acceptable?

73... N9NWO

NNNN

-----

Date: 21 May 93 15:58:23 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May19.184535.13332@leland.Stanford.EDU>,  
<1993May20.123327.25609@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May20.170751.18606@leland.Stanford.EDU>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May20.170751.18606@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993May20.123327.25609@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>It's true that I'm not working on HF SS at the moment, but neither are you.  
>>Instead I'm continuing to work on a time compressed slotted simplex repeater  
>>project at UHF with some bright no coders.  
>

>Much of my work is in algebraic coding theory and systems, so I'm trying to  
>concentrate my efforts there, in creating cost effective systems. I'm trying  
>to make something workable out of meteor burst...

Neat. I have a friend in Indiana who keeps bugging me to set up meteor burst data tests with him on 6 meters. Unfortunately I still don't have any 6 meter gear.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----  
Date: 21 May 93 15:54:31 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May19.190315.14206@leland.Stanford.EDU>,  
<1993May20.093239.24387@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May20.163302.17533@leland.Stanford.EDU>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May20.163302.17533@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu  
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>  
>I'm willing to concede that it is in fact a side effect, but it is still  
>relevant, given spectrum usage patterns. There are, however, different  
>means of acheiving the same goal. Perhaps, for example, we could make  
>spectrum usage a direct function of license class. For example, given  
>our hypothetical three license classes, give the lowest class the ability  
>to use HF, but only 500 Hz at a time. As the most populous license class,  
>want to bet that someone will manage to come up with an ultracheap advanced  
>digital mode to meet the demand?

That's actually a very good idea. I'd support such a plan wholeheartedly.

Gary

--  
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary  
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary  
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary  
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #159  
\*\*\*\*\*